

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. Previously, claim 15 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Specification

Amendments to the specification have been submitted herewith to ensure entry of the Article 34 Amendments. As noted above, both a clean copy and a marked-up copy of the specification have been submitted herewith. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 10 as including informalities. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that “strik” should be --strike--. However, Applicant was unable to find any instance of “strik” in claim 10 or any other claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9 under §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,546,671 to Mitchell (hereinafter Mitchell).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Mitchell fails to disclose all of the elements as now claimed.

More specifically, Mitchell fails to disclose a self latching bolt and apertures that provide for free passage to the bolt when the bolt and entry aperture are relatively disposed within a vertical range of dispositions and within a range of gap between the entry aperture and lock body. That is, Mitchell relates to sliding window locks, which do not have the above-noted structure.

Further, Mitchell fails to disclose a hinged door as now set forth in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Mitchell fails to anticipate claim 1. Likewise, this reference fails to anticipate the dependent claims 2-7 and 9.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 3,858,355 to Root (hereinafter Root) in view of Mitchell.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the references fail to disclose all of the elements as set forth and arranged in the claims.

The Examiner cites Root as disclosing a cam latch and keeper disposed on relatively hinged members, but continues to rely on the lock body structure of Mitchell. Thus, because the Examiner fails to set forth how Root discloses the lock body structure as claimed, Applicants do not address Root in this regard.

On the other hand, the Examiner relies on Mitchell as teaching the claimed lock body structure. Accordingly, Applicants address Mitchell in this regard. In this case, Mitchell's lock body structure fails to disclose a strike plate having an angled and/or curved blade portion as set forth in claim 8. Instead, Mitchell teaches a strike plate 70 having a planar face on which the engagement means is disposed, and there is no angled and/or curved blade portion extending therefrom.

In contrast to that taught by Mitchell, one embodiment consistent with that set forth in claim 8 includes a strike plate 5 having an angled or curved portion 22 extending from the planar face on which the engaging means' aperture 23 is located. See, for example, Fig. 3.

Thus, the Examiner's proposed combination of Root and Mitchell fails to render obvious the dependent claim 8.

Additionally, as noted above, Mitchell's lock structure is deficient. And these deficiencies are not cured by Root.

For at least any of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 10-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, because of the belief that claim 1 is allowable as now written, Applicant has not written these claims in independent form at this time.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Jeffrey A. Schmidt /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Jeffrey A. Schmidt
Registration No. 41,574

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 13, 2007